

imply certain things to other people in the community. So, if we are going to make it permissive and a thing to be determined by the family involved where religion is concerned, I think it ought to be permissive and determined by the family involved or put it on the same footing with people who don't have any religious preference of any kind. Autopsies are not pleasant. They are inconvenient and sometimes they turn up nothing. The cause of death is inconclusive. They cannot with the medical knowledge in science they have at their fingertips determine what caused a certain person to die and that's why autopsies are performed. I don't think that we are dealing here in 222 with the right of a person to practice his or her religion. This bill is not mandating that anybody utilize a doctor or take medication of any kind. The bill says that when death occurs under certain circumstances then there is going to be an autopsy. If this amendment says that under those circumstances an autopsy will occur even if you belong to one of these religious groups, then there is no purpose for the amendment. The amendment has to serve some purpose. Either it is creating a classification of people who are exempt from the provisions of 222 or it is not. If it is not creating such a special classification, it is saying that these people are in the same position as everybody else whether they belong to the religion or not. So to pass an amendment which, in fact, does nothing but may give the appearance of doing something is to create a hoax. But here is where it is more than a hoax. It can create grist for the litigation mill. Somebody could think that they have a basis on the language in this law to object to an autopsy being performed and require much litigation before a determination is finally arrived at. Since the amendment does not allow somebody on the basis of a religious profession....

SENATOR CLARK: You have one minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ....to exempt himself or herself or a member of the family from the provisions of 1 to 8 in the bill, the amendment does nothing. So since it does nothing, I am not in favor of putting it in the law as a sop to people who may have some concerns and some legitimate religious convictions to which I don't adhere. I am opposed to the amendment.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Fowler, do you wish to close on your amendment?

SENATOR FOWLER: Again, if you were to take the amendment and integrate it into the bill as it now, the white copy